



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,862	09/11/2003	Wael R. Joseph	KCC 4979.2 (K-C 19,378C)	5051
45736	7590	10/09/2007	EXAMINER	
Christopher M. Goff (27839) ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			AHMED, HASAN SYED	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		1615
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		PAPER
10/09/2007				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/659,862	JOSEPH, ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hasan S. Ahmed	1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt is acknowledged of applicants' request for continued examination, which was filed on 12 September 2007.

* * * * *

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12 September 2007 has been entered.

* * * * *

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,682) in view of Krzysik, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,440,437).

Klofta, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (see claim 1). The tissue product is comprised of:

- the emollient (fatty acid) of instant claim 1 (see abstract);
- the humectant (polyols) of instant claim 1 (see col. 25, line 16);
- the immobilizing agent (fatty alcohols) of instant claim 1 (see col. 24, lines 4-14);
- the compatibilizing (propylene glycol) agent of instant claim 1 (see col. 17, line 28);
- the fatty acids of instant claim 2 (see abstract);
- the dimethicone of instant claim 3 (see col. 20, line 18);
- the glycerin of instant claims 5-7 (see col. 17, line 21);
- the polyethylene glycol of instant claims 9 and 10 (see col. 17, lines 20-42);
- the stearyl alcohol, of instant claim 11 (see col. 24, line 11);
- the propylene glycol of instant claim 12 (see col. 17, line 22);
- the dispersing agent of instant claim 13 (see col. 22, line 24);
- the polydimethylsiloxanes of instant claim 14 (see col. 22, line 24); and
- the surfactant of instant claim 25 (see col. 5, line 17).

Klofta, *et. al.* explain that combining the disclosed ingredients into one tissue product is beneficial because they impart, "...a soft and lubricious feel..." See col. 4, line 41.

Klofta, *et. al.* teach: (1) about 5% to about 50% emollient (see col. 19, lines 25 and 26); (2) about 5% to about 60% humectant (see col. 17, line 42); (3) about 5% to about 60% immobilizing agent (see col. 27, line 15); and (4) about 5% to about 50% compatibilizing agent (see col. 19, lines 25 and 26).

Although Klofta, *et. al.* do not explicitly teach all the percentages recited in instant claims 1, 4, and 8, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to determine suitable percentages through routine or manipulative experimentation to obtain the best possible results, as these are variable parameters attainable within the art.

Moreover, generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration is critical. “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456; 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Applicants have not demonstrated any unexpected or unusual results, which accrue from the instant percentage ranges.

The Klofta, et. al. reference is silent with respect to the (1) phase temperatures of instant claims 1 and 28-30; (2) melting point of instant claim 26; (3) and penetration hardness of instant claim 27. Applicants teach concentration ranges of emollient, humectant, immobilizing agent, and compatibilizing agent that overlap with the prior art. Properties are the same when the structure and composition are the same. Thus, burden shifts to applicant to show unexpected results, by declaration or otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed properties would have been present once the composition was employed in its intended use. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent into a tissue product, as taught by Klofta, et. al. One of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine these ingredients into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of a soft and lubricious feel, as explained by Klofta, *et. al.*

The Klofta, *et. al.* reference differs from the instant application in that it does not teach the skin barrier of instant claims 15-17, the antioxidant of instant claims 18-20, and the sterol of instant claims 21 and 22.

Krzysik, *et. al.* teach a wipe (see abstract) comprising:

- the about 0.1% to about 30% skin barrier enhancing agent of instant claim 15 (see col. 4, line 9);
- the oil of instant claim 16 (see col. 4, line 2);
- the avocado oil of instant claim 17 (see col. 4, line 2);
- 0.3% antioxidant (within the range of instant claim 18; see col. 17, Formulas 1-7);
- the tocopherol of instant claims 19 and 20 (see col. 17, Formulas 1-7);
- the about 0.1% to about 10% sterol of instant claim 21 (see col. 7, line 56); and
- the cholesterol of instant claim 22 (see col. 4, line 4).

Krzysik, *et. al.* explain that combining the disclosed ingredients into one wipe is beneficial because they, "...help maintain skin barrier function..." See col. 2, lines 64-65.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine an emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, a compatibilizing agent, a skin barrier enhancing agent, an antioxidant, and a sterol into a tissue product, as taught by Klofta, *et. al.* in view of Krzysik, *et. al.* One of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine these ingredients into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of a soft and lubricious feel, as explained by Klofta, *et. al.* and to help maintain skin barrier function, as explained by Krzysik, *et. al.*

*

2. Claims 1, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klofta, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,238,682) in view of Krzysik, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,440,437), further in view of Bowser, *et. al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,342,976).

Klofta, *et. al.* teach a tissue product (see above).

Krzysik, *et. al.* teach a wipe (see above)

The Klofta, *et. al.* and Krzysik, *et. al.* references differ from the instant application in that it does not teach the ceramide and glucosylceramide of instant claims 23 and 24.

Bowser, *et. al.* teach a skin composition that may be used in a tissue product, such as a tissue wipe (see col. 16, line 44).

The disclosed composition contains the ceramide and glucosylceramide of instant claims 23 and 24 (see col. 1, line 67).

Bowser, *et. al.* explain that a ceramide, such as glucosylceramide, is beneficial in a skin composition because, "...when applied topically to the skin, bring(s) about a marked improvement in skin condition, by enhancing skin barrier function." See col. 2, lines 7-9.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a ceramide, such as glucosylceramide to a tissue product,

as taught by Klofta, *et. al.* in view of Bowser, *et. al.* One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to this ingredient into a tissue product for the beneficial effect of enhancing skin barrier function, as explained by Bowser, *et. al.*

* * * * *

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-61 of copending Application No. 10/659,969 ('969). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '969 claims an absorbent product comprising a moisturizing and lubricating composition comprising an

emollient, a humectant, an immobilizing agent, and a compatibilizing agent. See claim 1.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

* * * * *

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 12 September 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1. Applicants argue that the Klofta reference fails to disclose a skin barrier enhancing agent. See remarks, page 21.

Examiner respectfully submits that this argument has been rendered moot by the combination of Klofta with Krzysik.

*

2. Applicants argue that, "...it is not foreseeable or predictable that one skilled in the art could simply combine additional components into the Klofta, et al. formulation to arrive at the specific compositions, having the specific desirable physical properties of Applicant's claim 1." Emphasis removed. See remarks, page 24.

Both the Klofta and Krzysik references are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. skin care products. Both contain ingredients that are commonly used in the art. As such, examiner respectfully submits that it would not be unforeseeable for a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Klofta and Krzysik to arrive at the instantly claimed composition.

*

3. Applicants argue that Klofta fails to teach the ranges of instant claim 1. See remarks, page 25, first full-paragraph.

Examiner respectfully submits that the Klofta reference teaches the same ingredients as instant claim 1 at concentration ranges overlapping with the ranges of instant claim 1.

Specifically, Klofta discloses (1) about 5% to about 50% emollient (see col. 19, lines 25 and 26); (2) about 5% to about 60% humectant (see col. 17, line 42); (3) about 5% to about 60% immobilizing agent (see col. 27, line 15); and (4) about 5% to about 50% compatibilizing agent (see col. 19, lines 25 and 26).

As explained in the substantive rejection, above, applicants claim concentration ranges of emollient, humectant, immobilizing agent, and compatibilizing agent that overlap with the prior art. Properties are the same when the structure and composition are the same. Thus, burden shifts to applicant to show unexpected results, by declaration or otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed properties would have been present once the composition was employed in its intended use. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

*

4. Applicants argue that the immobilizing agent is disclosed by Klofta as an optional ingredient, and that when the immobilizing agents are present, "...Klofta, et al. disclose using significantly lower amounts of immobilizing agent." See paragraph bridging pages 25-26.

The applicant's arguments are based on what the examiner believes to be a narrow interpretation of the prior art. A reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art, including non-preferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 975 (1989). Klofta discloses a concentration of immobilizing agent up to 60% (see col. 19, lines 25 and 26). It is the position of the examiner that one of ordinary skill in the art, given both the prior art and the claims in their present form their broadest reasonable interpretation, would find the claimed invention obvious in view of the prior art. See MPEP § 2111 and 2123.

*

5. Applicants argue that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the Klofta and Krzysik references because they disclose different water concentrations.
See remarks, page 29.

Examiner respectfully submits that the compositions of the Klofta and Krzysik references are chemically compatible. As such, a combination of the compositions would not present any technical difficulties.

*

6. Applicants argue that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the Klofta and Bowser references because they disclose different water concentrations.
See remarks, page 32.

Examiner respectfully submits that the compositions of the Klofta and Bowser references are chemically compatible. As such, a combination of the compositions would not present any technical difficulties.

★

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hasan S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-4792. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


HUMERA N. SHEIKH
PRIMARY EXAMINER